arXiv:1411.1581v1 [hep-ph] 6 Nov 2014

Mathematica and Fortran programs for various analytic QCD couplings [1]

César Ayala and Gorazd Cvetič

Department of Physics, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Casilla 110-V, Valparaíso, Chile

E-mail: gorazd.cvetic@gmail.com

Abstract. We outline here the motivation for the existence of analytic QCD models, i.e., QCD frameworks in which the running coupling $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ has no Landau singularities. The analytic (holomorphic) coupling $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ is the analog of the underlying pQCD coupling $a(Q^2) \equiv \alpha_s(Q^2)/\pi$, and any such $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ defines an analytic QCD model. We present the general construction procedure for the couplings $\mathcal{A}_\nu(Q^2)$ which are analytic analogs of the powers $a(Q^2)^\nu$. Three analytic QCD models are presented. Applications of our program (in Mathematica) for calculation of $\mathcal{A}_\nu(Q^2)$ in such models are presented. Programs in both Mathematica and Fortran can be downloaded from the web page: gcvetic.usm.cl.

1. Why analytic QCD?

Perturbative QCD (pQCD) running coupling $a(Q^2)$ [$\equiv \alpha_s(Q^2)/\pi$, where $Q^2 \equiv -q^2$] has unphysical (Landau) singularities at low spacelike momenta $0 < Q^2 \lesssim 1$ GeV^2.

For example, the one-loop pQCD running coupling

$$a(Q^2)^{(1-\ell.)} = \frac{1}{\beta_0 \ln(Q^2/\Lambda^2_{\rm Lan.})} \tag{1}$$

has a Landau singularity (pole) at $Q^2 = \Lambda^2_{\rm Lan.}$ (~ 0.1 GeV^2). The 2-loop pQCD coupling $a(Q^2)^{(2-\ell.)}$ has a Landau pole at $Q^2 = \Lambda^2_{\rm Lan.}$ and Landau cut at $0 < Q^2 < \Lambda^2_{\rm Lan.}$.

It is expected that the true QCD coupling $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ has no such singularities. Why?

General principles of QFT dictate that any spacelike observable $\mathcal{D}(Q^2)$ (correlators of currents, structure functions, etc.) is an analytic (holomorphic) function of Q^2 in the entire Q^2 complex plane with the exception of the timelike axis: $Q^2 \in \mathbb{C}\backslash(-\infty, -M^2_{\rm thr.}]$, where $M_{\rm thr.} \sim 0.1$ GeV is a threshold mass ($\sim M_\pi$). If $\mathcal{D}(Q^2)$ can be evaluated as a leading-twist term, then it is a function of the running coupling $a(\kappa Q^2)$ where $\kappa \sim 1$: $\mathcal{D}(Q^2) = \mathcal{F}(a(\kappa Q^2))$. Then the argument $a(\kappa Q^2)$ is expected to have the same analyticity properties as $\mathcal{D}$, which is not the case with the pQCD coupling in the usual renormalization schemes ($\overline{\rm MS}$, 't Hooft, etc.).

A QCD coupling $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ with holomorphic behavior for $Q^2 \in \mathbb{C}\backslash(-\infty, -M^2_{\rm thr.}]$, represents an analytic QCD model (anQCD).

[1] Preprint USM-TH-330. Based on the presentation given by G.C. at the 16th International workshop on Advanced Computing and Analysis Techniques in physics research (ACAT 2014), Prague, Czech Republic, September 1-5, 2014. To appear in the proceedings by the IOP Conference Series publishing.

Such holomorphic behavior comes usually together with (IR-fixed-point) behavior [$\mathcal{A}(0) < \infty$]. The IR-fixed-point behavior of $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ is suggested by:

- lattice calculations [1, 2, 3]; calculations based on Dyson-Schwinger equations (DSE) [4, 5]; Gribov-Zwanziger approach [6, 7];
- The holomorphic $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ with IR-fixed-point behavior was proposed in various analytic QCD models, among them:
  - (i) Analytic Perturbation Theory (APT) of Shirkov, Solovtsov et al. [8, 9, 10, 11, 12];
  - (ii) its extension Fractional APT (FAPT) [13, 14, 15];
  - (iii) analytic models with $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ very close to $a(Q^2)$ at high $|Q^2| > \Lambda^2_{\rm Lan.}$: $\mathcal{A}(Q^2) - a(Q^2) \sim (\Lambda^2_{\rm Lan.}/Q^2)^N$ with $N = 3, 4$ or 5, [16, 17, 18, 19];
  - (iv) Massive Perturbation Theory (MPT), [20, 21, 22, 23].

Perturbative QCD (pQCD) can give analytic coupling $a(Q^2)$ in specific schemes with IR fixed point; the condition of reproduction of the correct value of the (strangeless and massless) semihadronic τ lepton $V + A$ decay ratio $r_\tau \approx 0.20$ strongly restricts such schemes [24, 25, 26].

If the analytic coupling $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ is not perturbative, $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ differs from the pQCD couplings $a(Q^2)$ at $|Q| \gtrsim 1$ GeV by nonperturbative (NP) terms, typically by some power-suppressed terms $\sim 1/Q^{2N}$ or $1/[Q^{2N} \ln^K(Q^2/\Lambda^2_{\rm Lan.})]$.

An analytic QCD model which gives $\mathcal{A}(0) = \infty$ was constructed in [27, 28, 29].

2. The formalism of constructing $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ in general anQCD

Having $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ [the analytic analog of $a(Q^2)$] specified, we want to evaluate the physical QCD quantities $\mathcal{D}(Q^2)$ in terms of such $\mathcal{A}(\kappa Q^2)$.

Usually $\mathcal{D}(Q^2)$ is known as a (truncated) power series in terms of the pQCD coupling $a(\kappa Q^2)$:

$$\mathcal{D}(Q^2)^{[N]}_{\rm pt} = a(\kappa Q^2)^{\nu_0} + d_1(\kappa) a(\kappa Q^2)^{\nu_0+1} + \ldots + d_{N-1}(\kappa) a(\kappa Q^2)^{\nu_0+N-1}. \tag{2}$$

In anQCD, the simple replacement $a(\kappa Q^2)^{\nu_0+m} \mapsto \mathcal{A}(Q^2)^{\nu_0+m}$ is not correct, it leads to a strongly diverging series when N increases, as argued in [30]; a different formalism was needed, and was developed for general anQCD, first for the case of integer ν_0 [31, 32], and then for the case of general ν_0 [33]. It results in the replacements

$$a(\kappa Q^2)^{\nu_0+m} \mapsto \mathcal{A}_{\nu_0+m}(Q^2) \quad \left[\neq \mathcal{A}(Q^2)^{\nu_0+m}\right] , \tag{3}$$

where the construction of the analytic power analogs $\mathcal{A}_{\nu_0+m}(Q^2)$ from $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ was obtained.

The construction starts with logarithmic derivatives of $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ [where $\beta_0 = (11 - 2N_f/3)/4$]:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{n+1}(Q^2) \equiv \frac{(-1)^n}{\beta_0^n n!} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \ln Q^2}\right)^n \mathcal{A}(Q^2) , \qquad (n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots) , \tag{4}$$

and $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_1 \equiv \mathcal{A}$. Using the Cauchy theorem, these quantities can be expressed in terms of the discontinuity function of anQCD coupling $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ along its cut, $\rho(\sigma) \equiv {\rm Im}\mathcal{A}(-\sigma - i\epsilon)$

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{n+1}(Q^2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{(-1)}{\beta_0^n \Gamma(n+1)} \int_0^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \rho(\sigma) {\rm Li}_{-n}(-\sigma/Q^2) . \tag{5}$$

This construction can be extended to a general noninteger $n \mapsto \nu$

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\nu+1}(Q^2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{(-1)}{\beta_0^\nu \Gamma(\nu+1)} \int_0^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{\sigma} \rho(\sigma) {\rm Li}_{-\nu}\left(-\frac{\sigma}{Q^2}\right) \quad (-1 < \nu) . \tag{6}$$

This can be recast into an alternative form, involving $\mathcal{A}$ ($\equiv \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_1$) instead of ρ

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\delta+m}(Q^2) \;=\; K_{\delta,m}\left(\frac{d}{d\ln Q^2}\right)^m \int_0^1 \frac{d\xi}{\xi}\mathcal{A}(Q^2/\xi)\ln^{-\delta}\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right)\,, \tag{7}$$

where: $0 \le \delta < 1$ and $m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$; $K_{\delta,m} = (-1)^m \beta_0^{-\delta-m+1}/[\Gamma(\delta+m)\Gamma(1-\delta)]$. This expression was obtained from Eq. (6) by the use of the following expression for the $\mathrm{Li}_{-\nu}(z)$ function [34]:

$$\mathrm{Li}_{-n-\delta}(z) = \left(\frac{d}{d\ln z}\right)^{n+1}\left[\frac{z}{\Gamma(1-\delta)}\int_0^1 \frac{d\xi}{1-z\xi}\ln^{-\delta}\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right)\right] \quad (n=-1,0,1,\ldots;0<\delta<1)\,. \tag{8}$$

The analytic analogs $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ of powers a^ν are then obtained by combining various generalized logarithmic derivatives (with the coefficients $\widetilde{k}_m(\nu)$ obtained in [33])

$$\mathcal{A}_\nu = \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_\nu + \sum_{m\ge 1}\widetilde{k}_m(\nu)\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\nu+m}\,. \tag{9}$$

3. The considered anQCD models

We constructed Mathematica and Fortran programs for three anQCD models: 1.) Fractional Analytic Perturbation Theory (FAPT) [13, 14, 15]; 2.) 2δ analytic QCD (2δanQCD) [19]; 3.) Massive Perturbation Theory (MPT) [20, 21, 22, 23]. These three models are described below.

3.1. anQCD models: FAPT

Application of the Cauchy theorem to the function $a(Q'^2)^\nu/(Q'^2 - Q^2)$ gives

$$a(Q^2)^\nu = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\sigma=-\Lambda^2_{\mathrm{Lan.}}-\eta}^{\infty}\frac{d\sigma \mathrm{Im}(a(-\sigma-i\epsilon)^\nu)}{(\sigma+Q^2)}, \quad (\eta\to+0). \tag{10}$$

In FAPT, the integration over the Landau part of the cut in the above integral is eliminated; since $\sigma \equiv -Q^2$, the Landau cut is $-\Lambda^2_{\mathrm{Lan.}} < \sigma < 0$. This leads to the FAPT coupling

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\mathrm{FAPT})}_\nu(Q^2) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\sigma=0}^{\infty}\frac{d\sigma \mathrm{Im}(a(-\sigma-i\epsilon)^\nu)}{(\sigma+Q^2)}\,. \tag{11}$$

3.2. anQCD models: 2δQCD

Here, $\rho(\sigma) \equiv \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}(-\sigma - i\epsilon)$ is approximated at high momenta $\sigma \ge M_0^2$ by $\rho^{(\mathrm{pt})}(\sigma)$ [$\equiv$ Im $a(-\sigma - i\epsilon)$], and in the unknown low-momentum regime by two deltas:

$$\rho^{(2\delta)}(\sigma) = \pi F_1^2\delta(\sigma - M_1^2) + \pi F_2^2\delta(\sigma - M_2^2) + \Theta(\sigma - M_0^2)\rho^{(\mathrm{pt})}(\sigma) \quad \Rightarrow \tag{12}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^{(2\delta)}_\nu(Q^2) = \frac{(-1)}{\beta_0^\nu\Gamma(\nu+1)}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{2}\frac{F_j^2}{M_j^2}\mathrm{Li}_{-\nu}\left(-\frac{M_j^2}{Q^2}\right) + \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{M_0^2}^{\infty}\frac{d\sigma}{\sigma}\mathrm{Im}a(-\sigma-i\epsilon)\mathrm{Li}_{-\nu}\left(-\frac{\sigma}{Q^2}\right)\right\}. \tag{13}$$

The parameters F_j^2 and M_j ($j = 1, 2$) are fixed in such a way that the resulting deviation from the underlying pQCD at high $|Q^2| > \Lambda^2$ is: $\mathcal{A}^{(2\delta)}_\nu(Q^2) - a(Q^2)^\nu \sim (\Lambda^2/Q^2)^5$. The pQCD-onset scale M_0 is determined so that the model reproduces the measured (strangeless and massless) $V + A$ tau lepton semihadronic decay ratio $r_\tau \approx 0.20$.

The underlying pQCD coupling a is chosen in 2δanQCD, for calculational convenience, in the Lambert-scheme form

$$a(Q^2) = -\frac{1}{c_1}\frac{1}{1 - c_2/c_1^2 + W_{\mp 1}(z_\pm)} \,, \tag{14}$$

where: $c_1 = \beta_1/\beta_0$; $Q^2 = |Q^2|\mathrm{e}^{i\phi}$, the upper (lower) sign when $\phi \geq 0$ ($\phi < 0$), and

$$z_\pm = (c_1 \mathrm{e})^{-1} (|Q^2|/\Lambda^2)^{-\beta_0/c_1} \exp\left[i(\pm\pi - \beta_0\phi/c_1)\right] . \tag{15}$$

3.3. anQCD models: MPT

Nonperturbative physics suggests that the gluon acquires at low momenta an effective (dynamical) mass $m_{\mathrm{gl}} \sim 1$ GeV, and that the coupling then has the form

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\mathrm{MPT})}(Q^2) = a(Q^2 + {m_{\mathrm{gl}}}^2) \,. \tag{16}$$

Since $m_{\mathrm{gl}} > \Lambda_{\mathrm{Lan.}}$, the new coupling has no Landau singularities.

The (generalized) logarithmic derivatives $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\delta+m}^{(\mathrm{MPT})}(Q^2)$ are then uniquely determined

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\delta+m}(Q^2) = K_{\delta,m} \left(\frac{d}{d\ln Q^2}\right)^m \int_0^1 \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \mathcal{A}^{(\mathrm{MPT})}(Q^2/\xi) \ln^{-\delta}\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right) . \tag{17}$$

4. Numerical implementation and results

Programs of numerical implementation in anQCD models:

- for integer power analogs $\mathcal{A}_n(Q^2)$ in APT and in "massive QCD" [35, 36]: Nesterenko and Simolo, 2010 (in Maple) [37], and 2011 (in Fortran) [38];
- for general power analogs $\mathcal{A}_\nu(Q^2)$ in FAPT: Bakulev and Khandramai, 2013 (in Mathematica) [39];
- for general power analogs $\mathcal{A}_\nu(Q^2)$ in 2δanQCD, MPT and FAPT: the presented work in Mathematica [40] and Fortran (programs in both languages can be downloaded from the web page: **gcvetic.usm.cl**).

The basic relations for the numerical implementation of $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ are: in FAPT Eq. (11); in 2δanQCD Eqs. (13) and (9); in MPT Eqs. (17) and (9).

In Mathematica, $\mathrm{Li}_{-\nu}(z)$ is implemented as PolyLog$[-\nu, z]$. In Mathematica 9.0.1 it is unstable for $|z| \gg 1$. Therefore, we provide a subroutine Li_nu.m (which is called by the main Mathematica program anQCD.m) and gives a stable version under the name polylog$[-\nu, z]$. This problem does not exist in Mathematica 10.0.1.

In Fortran, program Vegas [41] is used for integrations. However, in Fortran, $\mathrm{Li}_{-\nu}(z)$ function is not implemented for general (complex) z, and is evaluated as an integral Eq. (8). Therefore, the evaluation of $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_\nu$'s in 2$\delta$anQCD is somewhat more time consuming in Fortran than in Mathematica. Further, more care has to be taken in Fortran to deal correctly with singularities of the integrands.



Figure 1. $\mathcal{A}_1 \equiv \mathcal{A}$ in three anQCD models with $\nu = 1$ and $N_f = 3$, as a function of Q^2 for $Q^2 > 0$; the underlying pQCD coupling a is included for comparison: (a) 2δanQCD coupling and pQCD coupling, in the Lambert scheme with $c_2 = -4.9$ (and $c_j = c_2^{j-1}/c_1^{j-2}$ for $j \geq 3$); (b) FAPT and MPT in 4-loop $\overline{\rm MS}$ scheme and with $\overline{\Lambda}_3^2 = 0.1$ GeV^2; MPT is with $m_{\rm gl}^2 = 0.7$ GeV^2.



Figure 2. The same as in Fig. 1, but with $\nu = 0.3$ ($\mathcal{A}_{\nu=0.3}$). $\mathcal{A}_{0.3}$ is calculated from $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{0.3+m}$ using the relation (9) with $\nu_0 = 0.3$, and truncation at $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{0.3+4}$ in 2δanQCD, and at $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{0.3+3}$ in MPT; and in FAPT using Eq. (11). Figs. 1 and 2 are taken from [40].

5. Main procedures in Mathematica for three analytic QCD models

1.) AFAPTNl$[N_f, \nu, 0, |Q^2|, \Lambda^2, \phi]$ gives N-loop ($N = 1, 2, 3, 4$) analytic FAPT coupling $\mathcal{A}_\nu^{(\mathrm{FAPT},N)}(Q^2, N_f)$ with real power index ν, with fixed number of active quark flavors N_f, in the Euclidean domain [$Q^2 = |Q^2| \exp(i\phi) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $Q^2 \not< 0$]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{AFAPT}N\mathrm{l}[Nf, \nu, 0, Q2, L2, \phi] \quad &= \quad \mathcal{A}_\nu^{(\mathrm{FAPT},N)}[Q2 = |Q^2|, \phi = \arg(Q^2); Nf = N_f; L2 = \overline{\Lambda}_{N_f}^2] \\ &\quad (N = 1, 2, 3, 4\,;\ Nf = 3, 4, 5, 6). \end{aligned}$$

2.) A2dNl$[N_f, M, \nu, |Q^2|, \phi]$ gives "N-loop" 2δanQCD coupling $\mathcal{A}_{\nu+M}^{(2\delta)}(Q^2, N_f)$, with power index $\nu + M$ ($\nu > -1$ and real; $M = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1$), with number of active quark flavors N_f, in the Euclidean domain. It is used in the N^{N-1}LO truncation approach [where in (9): $\nu_0 \mapsto \nu$ and $n \mapsto M$, and we truncate at $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\nu+N-1}$]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{A2d}N\mathrm{l}[Nf, M, \nu, Q2, \phi] \quad &= \quad \mathcal{A}_{\nu+M}^{(2\delta)}[Q2 = |Q^2|, \phi = \arg(Q^2); Nf = N_f]\,, \\ &\quad (N = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5;\ Nf = 3, 4, 5, 6;\ M = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1). \end{aligned}$$

3.) AMPTNl$[N_f, \nu, Q^2, {m_{\rm gl}}^2, \overline{\Lambda}^2_{N_f}]$ gives N-loop ($N = 1, 2, 3, 4$) analytic MPT coupling $\mathcal{A}^{(\mathrm{MPT},N)}_\nu(Q^2, {m_{\rm gl}}^2, N_f)$, with real power index ν ($0 < \nu < 5$) and with number of active quark flavors N_f, in the Euclidean domain ($Q^2 \in \mathcal{C}$ and $Q^2 \not< 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{AMPT}N\mathrm{l}[Nf, \nu, Q2, M2, L2] \;\; &= \;\; \mathcal{A}^{(\mathrm{MPT,N})}_\nu[Q2{=}Q^2{\in}\mathcal{C}; Nf{=}N_f; M2{=}{m_{\rm gl}}^2; L2{=}\overline{\Lambda}^2_{N_f}] \\ &\quad (N = 1, 2, 3, 4\,;\; Nf = 3, 4, 5, 6)\,;\; 0 < \nu < 5). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Examples:
Input scale of the underlying $\overline{\rm MS}$ pQCD for FAPT and MPT is $\overline{\Lambda}^2_3 = 0.1$ GeV^2. The times are for a typical laptop, using Mathematica 9.0.1; the first entry in the results is the time of calculation, in s.

In[1]:= <<anQCD.m;
In[2]:= AFAPT3l[5, 1, 0, 10^2, 0.1, 0] // Timing
Out[2]= $\{0.382942, 0.0624843\}$
In[3]:= AMPT3l[5, 1, 10^2, 0.7, 0.1] // Timing
Out[3]= $\{0.108983, 0.0627726\}$
In[4]:= A2d3l[5, 0, 1, 10^2, 0] // Timing
Out[4]=$\{0.768884, 0.0559182\}$
In[5]:= AFAPT3l[3, 1, 0, 0.5, 0.1, 0] // Timing
Out[5]= $\{0.378943, 0.121853\}$
In[6]:= AMPT3l[3, 1, 0.5, 0.7, 0.1] // Timing
Out[6]= $\{0.106984, 0.132199\}$
In[7]:= A2d3l[3, 0, 1, 0.5, 0] // Timing
Out[7]= $\{0.775882, 0.163402\}$
In[8]:= AFAPT3l[3, 0.3, 0, 0.5, 0.1, 0] // Timing
Out[8]= $\{0.456930, 0.556644\}$
In[9]:= AMPT3l[3, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.1] // Timing
Out[9]=$\{0.110983, 0.569473\}$
In[10]:= A2d3l[3, 0, 0.3, 0.5, 0] // Timing
Out[10]= $\{3.125525, 0.576005\}$

6. Conclusions

We constructed programs, in Mathematica and Fortran, which evaluate couplings $\mathcal{A}_\nu(Q^2)$ in three models of analytic QCD (FAPT, 2δanQCD, and MPT). These couplings are holomorphic functions (free of Landau singularities) in the complex Q^2 plane with the exception of the negative semiaxis, and are analogs of powers $a(Q^2)^\nu \equiv (\alpha_s(Q^2)/\pi)^\nu$ of the underlying perturbative QCD. We checked that our results in FAPT model agree with those of Mathematica program [39].

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by FONDECYT (Chile) Grant No. 1130599 and DGIP (UTFSM) internal project USM No. 11.13.12 (C.A and G.C).

References

[1] Cucchieri A and Mendes T 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** 241601 (arXiv:0712.3517 [hep-lat])
[2] Bogolubsky I L, Ilgenfritz E M, Müller-Preussker M and Sternbeck A 2009 *Phys. Lett.* B **676** 69 (arXiv:0901.0736 [hep-lat])
[3] Furui S 2009 *PoS LAT* **2009** 227 (arXiv:0908.2768 [hep-lat])

[4] Lerche C and von Smekal L 2002 *Phys. Rev.* D **65** 125006 (hep-ph/0202194)
[5] Aguilar A C and Papavassiliou J 2008 *Eur. Phys. J.* A **35** 189 (arXiv:0708.4320 [hep-ph])
[6] Zwanziger D 2004 *Phys. Rev.* D **69** 016002 (hep-ph/0303028)
[7] Dudal D, Gracey J A, Sorella S P, Vandersickel N and Verschelde H 2008 *Phys. Rev.* D **78** 065047 (arXiv:0806.4348 [hep-th])
[8] Shirkov D V and Solovtsov I L 1996 *JINR Rapid Commun.* 2[76] 5–10 (arXiv:hep-ph/9604363)
[9] Shirkov D V and Solovtsov I L 1997 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 79 1209–1212 (arXiv:hep-ph/9704333)
[10] Milton K A and Solovtsov I L 1997 *Phys. Rev.* D **55** 5295–98 (arXiv:hep-ph/9611438)
[11] Shirkov D V 2001 *Eur. Phys. J.* C **22** 331 (hep-ph/0107282)
[12] Karanikas A I and Stefanis N G 2001 *Phys. Lett.* B **504** 225 (hep-ph/0101031)
[13] Bakulev A P, Mikhailov S V and Stefanis N G 2005 *Phys. Rev.* D **72** 074014 (arXiv:hep-ph/0506311)
[14] Bakulev A P, Mikhailov S V and Stefanis N G 2007 *Phys. Rev.* D **75** 056005 (arXiv:hep-ph/0607040)
[15] Bakulev A P, Mikhailov S V and Stefanis N G 2010 *JHEP* **1006** 085 (arXiv:1004.4125 [hep-ph])
[16] Webber B R 1998 *JHEP* **9810** 012 (hep-ph/9805484)
[17] Alekseev A I 2006 *Few Body Syst.* **40** 57 (arXiv:hep-ph/0503242)
[18] Contreras C, Cvetič G, Espinosa O and Martínez H E 2010 *Phys. Rev.* D **82** 074005 (arXiv:1006.5050)
[19] Ayala C, Contreras C and Cvetič G 2012 *Phys. Rev.* D **85** 114043 (arXiv:1203.6897 [hep-ph])
[20] Simonov Yu A 1995 *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **58** 107 (hep-ph/9311247)
[21] Simonov Yu A 2010 arXiv:1011.5386 [hep-ph]
[22] Badalian A M and Kuzmenko D S 2001 *Phys. Rev.* D **65** 016004 (hep-ph/0104097)
[23] Shirkov D V 2013 *Phys. Part. Nucl. Lett.* **10** 186 (arXiv:1208.2103 [hep-th])
[24] Cvetič G, Kögerler R and Valenzuela C 2010 *J. Phys.* G **37** 075001 (arXiv:0912.2466 [hep-ph])
[25] Cvetič G, Kögerler R and Valenzuela C 2010 *Phys. Rev.* D **82** 114004 (arXiv:1006.4199 [hep-ph])
[26] Contreras C, Cvetič G, Kögerler R, Kröger P and Orellana O 2014 arXiv:1405.5815 [hep-ph].
[27] Nesterenko A V 2001 *Phys. Rev.* D **64** 116009 (arXiv:hep-ph/0102124)
[28] Nesterenko A V 2003 *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* A **18** 5475 (arXiv:hep-ph/0308288)
[29] Aguilar A C, Nesterenko A V and Papavassiliou J 2005 *J. Phys.* G **31** 997 (hep-ph/0504195)
[30] Cvetič G 2014 *Phys. Rev.* D **89** 036003 (arXiv:1309.1696 [hep-ph]).
[31] Cvetič G and Valenzuela C 2006 *J. Phys.* G **32** L27 (arXiv:hep-ph/0601050)
[32] Cvetič G and Valenzuela C 2006 *Phys. Rev.* D **74** 114030 (arXiv:hep-ph/0608256)
[33] Cvetič G and Kotikov A V 2012 *J. Phys.* G **39** 065005 (arXiv:1106.4275 [hep-ph])
[34] Kotikov A V, Krivokhizhin V G and Shaikhatdenov B G 2012 *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **75** 507
[35] Nesterenko A V and Papavassiliou J 2005 *Phys. Rev.* D **71** 016009 (hep-ph/0410406)
[36] Nesterenko A V 2009 *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **186** 207 (arXiv:0808.2043 [hep-ph])
[37] Nesterenko A V and Simolo C 2010 *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **181** 1769 (arXiv:1001.0901 [hep-ph])
[38] Nesterenko A V and Simolo C 2011 *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **182** 2303 (arXiv:1107.1045 [hep-ph])
[39] Bakulev A P and Khandramai V L 2013 *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **184** 183 (arXiv:1204.2679 [hep-ph])
[40] Ayala C and Cvetič G 2014 arXiv:1408.6868 [hep-ph].
[41] Lepage G P 1980 CLNS-80/447.